

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 18, 1952

FIVE CENTS

**All-Time High in Cost of Living
Becomes a Political Football**

... page 3

No Land Reform for Bolivia

... page 4

What Is the 'Crisis in Education'?

... The STUDENT SOCIALIST, page 8

CANDIDATE IN THE MAKING—II Stevenson as Politician

By DICK OLIVER

In 1947 Adlai Stevenson began preparations to run for public elective office for the first time, putting himself at the service of the notorious Kelley-Arvey Democratic machine in Chicago, which badly needed both a dressing-up with some respectable faces and a candidate to wage an apparently hopeless fight against the corrupt but seemingly entrenched Republican state administration headed by Governor Green and supported by Colonel McCormick.

In winning the governorship by a plurality of 572,000 votes (whereas Truman received only a 34,000 plurality in the same election), Stevenson even brought over solid Republican votes from the North Shore suburban socialites, among whose clubs he is a popular wit. Labor and the liberal Independent Voters of Illinois (local affiliate of Americans for Democratic Action) sparked his campaign and provided the bulk of his votes.

In return he gave them all streamlined and efficient government, reminiscent of that of Governor Dewey of New York, of whose state administrative methods he is an admirer.

Though the Chicago *Tribune* still refers to him as "Old Horsemeat Adlai," most people preferred to believe that the adulterated hamburger scandal resulted from the long notorious racketeering connections of the Cook County Democratic machine, especially since Stevenson promptly fired the guilty state meat inspectors involved. As an administrator, he makes a fetish out of his theory that local community problems must be solved by local people, without abdicating local responsibility to state or federal authority.

(Continued on page 6)

Labor Leaders Pushing Sparkman Sales Campaign

By GORDON HASKELL

Unpatriotic

The *Christian Century*, Protestant magazine, disillusioned the country and challenges the House Un-American Committee with a theological observation:

"God is not a Republican . . . or a Democrat . . . He is not even an American, shocking as it may seem to say it, and it is just possible that he thinks no more of the 'Star Spangled Banner' than he did of the battle cries of the Philistines or the war whoops of the Navajos."

Favorable, He Says

The president of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad has announced that the carrier has experienced "a period of favorable development."

He meant that the net profits had gone up more than 400 per cent, in the first six months of this year as compared with last.

The American labor movement is committed in this political campaign to play a more active role than ever before. Just how successful the labor leaders will be in organizing and delivering the labor vote this year will strongly influence the amount of political power which they will be able to gain both inside the Democratic Party and in the political life of the country as a whole. Their dramatic appearance at the Democratic convention as an organized bloc has put their political strategy before the workers more clearly than ever before. In a certain sense, they are on the spot, and they know it.

Hence it is specially interesting to observe, even at this

early stage, how the labor press is handling the election campaign as a whole, and the Democratic convention in particular. What kind of picture are the labor leaders trying to paint for the rank and file about their role in politics, and by what kind of arguments are they trying to get the millions of union members to follow their political leadership?

We are not in a position to give a thorough review of the whole labor press since the Democratic convention. We will deal with the *AFL News-Reporter*, official organ of the national AFL, a pamphlet issued by the Political Action Committee of the CIO, and a scattering of other labor newspapers.

The first major post-convention contribution of the PAC-CIO has

been to issue an attractive little pamphlet entitled *'52 Facts on Politics*. This is one of a series whose purpose is to convince workers that politics should be of vital concern to them. It describes the various ways in which the last Congress defeated subsidies to schools, yielded to American Medical Association pressure on all measures relating to health, defeated all measures to control rents or increase low-cost housing, passed taxes favoring the rich and pressing on the poor, defeated price controls, etc., etc.

It is characteristic of this type of publication that it does not tell the workers for whom they should vote in order to change Congress from a capitalist-dominated to a labor-dominated body. Although it is made quite clear that all the

(Continued on page 5)

Twenty-Five Years After Sacco and Vanzetti

Twenty-five years ago, this August 23, Nicolo Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti were murdered by the state of Massachusetts, after a case that reverberated around the world.

Inside this issue, we publish the memorial which Arthur Garfield Hayes has written for this anniversary. Here we want to ask the question which Vanzetti would undoubtedly have put to us of 1952.

It was Vanzetti who wrote a few hours before his death:

"What I wish more than all in this last hour of agony is that our case and our fate may be understood in their real being and serve as a tremendous lesson to the forces of freedom—so that our suffering and our death will not have been in vain."

Was it in vain?

Nothing is ever lost, and unknown thousands of people are different today because Sacco and Vanzetti died. And no fight for freedom was ever in vain, even though the cause lost as it did in 1927 in Boston, because the first principle of the fighter for human rights is: There is only one thing worse than being defeated in a battle against oppression, and that is—being defeated without a battle.

But though the martyrdom of the shoemaker and the fish-peddler still echoes in the consciences of the world, Sacco and Vanzetti would today look around the country and ask another question:

How is it with us in the United States now? Could it happen again?

Maybe the hangmen like the Judge Thayers are not as crude and raw as in the unsuitable days of the '20s and maybe they would no longer use the electric chair, but the witchhunt atmosphere that hung over Judge Thayer's court is the same climate that blankets the whole country today. *Anything goes*, said the respectable gentry of Massachusetts, since it was only a question of a couple of dirty anarchists, enemies of society. *Anything goes*, say the patriotic defenders of "national security" today as they adjust their consciences to the strain of subversive lists, government purges, loyalty oaths and McCarran concentration camps.

One more thing we would like to ask. The most glorious aspect of the Sacco-Vanzetti case was the tremendous outcry of articulate and indignant protest from people of all walks of life and all political views—protest in petitions, demonstrations and rallies. The conscience of a nation was provoked and it spoke out.

How many thousands today would fear to put their names to a petition in a similar case, or shrink from being photographed by the FBI in a protest parade?

This Sacco-Vanzetti anniversary will draw mention in many places, we hope. We hope, however, that their memories are not defiled by hypocrites and Pharisees who are willing to shed an inexpensive tear for the victims of a quarter century ago but who are unwilling to speak out against the assault on liberty which is going on now.

Liberal Party Dissenters Oppose Quick Endorsement Of Stevenson-Sparkman

By PETER WHITNEY

Liberal Party Leader

NEW YORK, Aug. 8.—At the State Conference of the Liberal Party held on August 5, the leadership encountered vigorous opposition from the floor with regard to its role at the Democratic Party convention and its support of Stevenson and Sparkman. The gathering, from which the press was barred and which has remained unreported, was attended by some specially invited 600 "leaders" of Liberal Party clubs, county committees, and trade unions, and was called to make recommenda-



DAVID DUBINSKY

(Continued on page 2)

Liberal Party Conference — —

(Continued from page 1)
tions to the pending State Committee meeting.

State Chairman Adolf A. Berle and Vice-Chairmen David Dubinsky and Alex Rose spoke of the enlarged role and significant influence of the liberals (with and without a capital) in the Democratic smokery. Stumping for Ke-fauver originally, they made their contribution to Democratic harmony by swinging to the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket as the one that "can be elected."

BERLE REPORTS

Berle reported that the Liberal leaders tried to persuade Stevenson and other key men to run Ke-fauver for vice-president, but these Democratic chieftains were obviously more concerned with keeping the South in line. Berle revealed that he had assured the Northern liberals that "when he was their age, he had felt the same way—no compromise with the South." Now at a more advanced age, he wants "action, not flowery words and whistle-stop speeches." But precisely what action can be expected from candidates who refuse to commit themselves was left vague by Berle.

Alex Rose, who is also president of the Hatters Union (AFL), analyzed the various tendencies in the liberal and labor circles with respect to the reactionary Southern bloc in the Democratic Party. Granting the strength of the movement to oust the Dixiecrats, Rose pointed out that the Democratic Party cannot win elections without their support, and given a split, Eisenhower would surely win. Rose stated that the Southern liberals are "right on all questions but civil rights," and that any one in the South who dares to be right on that question faces the political fate of Claude Pepper and Frank Graham.

WHAT COMPROMISE?

If Rose's criterion is that they fail to be elected (no worse fate can obviously befall a liberal candidate), he is indulging in the kind of thinking which accepts one compromise after another until nothing is left of the much-vaunted liberal fight for platform and program. "We must compromise to win," but then, considering the compromises made, just what is being won, and for whom? And as usual, the worse evil was trotted out: Isn't Nixon an arch-reactionary as compared with Sparkman, asked Rose, and "what's the alternative if we don't accept this ticket?" Hence, he concluded, "we must accept the ticket not apologetically though with regrets."

Upon the completion of these reports, the chair asked for a motion

to recommend support of Stevenson and Sparkman to the State Committee, which will meet on August 27. At this point, Benjamin McLaurin of the Sleeping Car Porters got the floor and opened the floodgates to a furious and heated discussion of the party's policies. The sharpness of the discussion and the widespread participation in it was obviously unexpected and took the leadership by surprise.

McLAURIN BLASTS

McLaurin launched a full-scale attack and minced no words in his scathing denunciation of Sparkman as a candidate completely unacceptable to him. He assured the South but his conscience wouldn't let him accept Sparkman. "I wonder about the sincerity of liberals as such when they tell us that we must accept Sparkman," he said — unusual language in the halls of the Liberal Party and indicative of the deep cleavages aroused by the issues under discussion.

"The liberals were well organized at the convention," McLaurin stated, but the liberals failed and they must admit it. Where they should have fought on platform and principles, they bogged down by concentrating on the phony oath of loyalty to the party. The liberals should have understood that the question of "civil rights affects and transcends the whole fabric of democracy," and if they give up here, they might as well stop preaching altogether.

SOUTH WON

Continuing his bombshell, McLaurin charged that the liberals had given the South an easy way out. All the South had to do was to sit back and watch us sweat and trade and sell out our principles for unity. "The South are the only victors, while the liberals stand compromised." The policy of the leadership has left the liberals between "the devil and the deep blue sea," and McLaurin insisted that the Negroes will never accept Sparkman.

McLaurin castigated the stand taken by Adam Clayton Powell as somewhat late in the day. He charged that Powell knew all about the deals that were made at the Democratic Party convention, and should have raised his voice at the convention itself and not safe in Harlem. He challenged the claim that the 1952 platform is superior to the 1948 one and attacked the ambiguity on the FEPC machinery and the omission of any mention of the poll tax.

WANTS PRESSURE

"The Liberal Party must take responsibility to show us out of this dilemma," and McLaurin demanded that commitments from the candidates for specific action must be made before the candi-

dates are endorsed. He asked: "What is Sparkman's position— and Stevenson's too—on changing the Senate rules on cloture?" How do they stand on concrete proposals concerning FEPC and civil rights?

McLaurin demanded that the Liberal Party arrange a conference with the candidates and get their commitments before any support is voted, "so that those who truly believe in our principles can give their all to the campaign — otherwise Negroes will never give their vote." Speaking as one of their outstanding leaders, McLaurin revealed the full depth of his bitterness when he repeated that he would not sell his conscience and he urged the conference to uphold liberal principles and demand specific commitments from the candidates before they support them.

WATERSHED

During McLaurin's stirring speech, sympathetic comments were made by rank-and-filers in the audience and heads were nodded in agreement with his strong points. But immediate hostility was the mood among the leadership on the platform, and they made their feelings plain enough. Their dark looks probably toned down the applause which greeted the conclusion of his speech, but didn't stop a multitude of hands from demanding the floor.

The many speakers who followed McLaurin arrayed themselves for and against the leadership to various degrees, but it was plain that McLaurin's speech acted like a watershed and sharply divided the streams of opinion. The discussion was undoubtedly the hottest that the Liberal Party has had in years, a fact which did not stop the metropolitan papers from reporting that a "practically unanimous" position was taken by the party.

DUBINSKY RAGES

The reporters can be excused for this inaccuracy since they were excluded from the conference and doubtlessly based themselves on accounts given by the leadership. But what excuse has the leadership when they report in one of their communications that the conference "voted almost unanimously (six nays) to recommend the endorsement of Governor Adlai Stevenson and Senator John Sparkman?"

The speeches ranged from even sharper attacks on the leadership to the usual quota of pro-leadership speakers. One speaker who pulled out all stops in his attack charged that "we have betrayed our faith in democracy and equality" and that the liberals acted in a sickening and disgusting manner in their surrender to the South. Dubinsky, who is not noted for his democratic tolerance for opposing points of view, snarled "snootiness" at the speaker and was quite beside himself with rage.

Echoing many a rank-and-filer's sentiment, one woman speaker said she was tired of rubber-stamping the Democratic Party and she hoped that the membership would think about all the liberals turned down by both parties. From her experiences in the South, she felt that a national Liberal Party should be built and then whole measures could be taken instead of half measures which satisfied no one.

ANTONINI'S LINE

Even those speakers who supported the ticket made little attempt to sell the conference on Sparkman but rather accepted him as a necessary evil if the Democrats are to win. They denounced those in disagreement as "extremists" who want utopia overnight, and naturally kept challenging them: What's your alternative? Eisenhower or Sparkman?

A State Committee member, Pearl Willen, supported McLaurin's motion and insisted that the Liberal Party must pin down Stevenson and Sparkman. "Stevenson said he

doesn't believe in FEPC unless, if, and when, and Sparkman has said he's against it," she charged. How can we commit ourselves to them unless we try to push them more to the left? Of course, none of them said what they would do if these candidates refused to commit themselves.

Luigi Antonini, one of the leaders of the Ladies Garment Workers, gave an unwitting answer to some of the critics when he agreed that if there were a national Liberal Party, they would be right to talk as they do. But since there isn't, the implication is that liberals must gratefully accept what the Democrats dish out and be glad that it isn't worse. His argument was simplicity itself: "The reactionaries claim that the Fair Deal is socialist, and you [meaning the critics] consider it not socialist enough?" Poison, he said, taken drop by drop can cure you but in large doses it can kill you. So, his conclusion was: go slow and eventually we'll have everything—even a Liberal Party on a national scale and our own national conventions.

NO PLACE TO GO

Murray Baron, New York County head, went whole-hog and announced he'd take the Democratic Party without any civil rights stand, and urged the conference not to send any delegation to Stevenson and Sparkman because we "must not insult them in such a manner by doubting their sincerity to act." (How low can such ex-socialists bow their heads?)

A trade-union speaker supported McLaurin and stressed that the leadership had placed the party in a dilemma with respect to carrying out the party's own pledges on civil rights. He pointed out that Sparkman had voted for the infamous Taft-Hartley Law and had opposed minimum-wage laws, and urged that the decision on the candidates be withheld.

Berle, as chairman, cut in after

various speakers and told the members that he would keep Stevenson informed of how the Liberal Party membership feels, including the views of the opposition, which "should keep him in line." At another point, when a speaker appealed to the Liberal leadership to utilize their strength in the right direction and not just to yield and compromise, Berle answered: "We can't exercise our leverage because we have no place else to go."

IN THE NECK?

But it was Dubinsky who was given the job of taking on the critics, and he did it with vigor and relish. He savagely informed the audience that any one who doesn't want to stay here can get out, but he's staying. He told McLaurin and Willen that he had been even madder than they and had spoken more strongly, but when there was no other alternative he cheerfully accepted Stevenson and Sparkman. Dubinsky even conceded that Roosevelt hadn't been right on all issues but they couldn't reject him. His guiding principle: "A Republican victory is a worse defeat than any Democratic candidate."

Dubinsky denounced the idea of getting commitments, and said that if he were Stevenson's advisor he would advise him not to take stands on certain issues. "I want him to be elected and then make promises," shouted Dubinsky, reversing the usual procedure. "It's better to worry now and to have four good years, and then you can say, you son-of-a-gun, stand by your platform." He howled at the opponents: "You can ask for pie in the sky, but how do you get it?" Using a trade-union analogy, he said that he's satisfied at first when the employer acknowledges the union, but then when you're inside, you get it.

Good enough, but haven't the Liberal Party leaders been "inside" a long, long time? And just when are they going to get it, in any other place but the neck?

IN UAW FORD LOCAL 600— Unit Elections Show Anti-Reuther Trend

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, August 10—General elections at Ford Local 600 of the United Auto Workers (CIO) will be held on September 9-11, it was announced yesterday by the administrators over that local union.

And unless every unit election and other indication is wrong, the general election will result in a triumph for the anti-Reuther forces.

The strategy of the Reuther administration of having piecemeal unit elections and concentrating on the opposition one at a time, simply didn't work. In many cases, both major slates were anti-Reuther, as in the big Motor building election, which saw a Stellato-backed candidate defeat Percy Llewellyn, a top pro-Stalinist in that local union.

The dissatisfaction in Reutherite circles over the whole mess at Ford Local 600 was made public this month by an article in the *Wage Earner*, organ of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, which quotes various

UAW officials in the right wing in a critical fashion.

Ed Lee, international union representative and member of Ford Local 600, is considered a likely candidate against Stellato. Lee's open criticism of the present strategy at Ford Local 600 suggests that he hasn't received the "nod" from Walter Reuther but is determined through public pressure to get it. Actually, the Reuther forces have not been able to find a suitable slate of candidates to oppose the anti-Reuther coalition.

About two months ago, Reuther tried to make a deal with Stellato, but it backfired when a big caucus meeting of the right-wing forces at Ford Local 600 vigorously protested. The leader in this revolt against a deal with Stellato was Ed Lee.

Of course, the \$64 question which many UAW activists are asking is this: Why, after six years in power, is the Reuther leadership unable to win the rank and file of Ford Local 600? What's happened to the Reuther tendency in the UAW?

Dems, GOP Seek Political Capital from HCL

By L. G. SMITH

The cost of living has reached a new all-time high. In the middle of June it was estimated on the basis of Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) that the average family had to pay \$1.90 to buy the same things it could buy for one dollar in 1935-39. By the middle of July, the same index indicated that the housewife now has to pay \$1.44 for what one dollar could buy of food at the beginning of the war in Korea.

All indications point to a continued rise in prices. The National Industrial Conference Board's consumers' price index shows that the latest rise in the cost of living was fueled by increases in the prices of fuel, food and sundries, although the cost of clothing and house furnishings has somewhat declined. This index indicates that although the upsurge of prices which followed the outbreak of the war in Korea seemed to have subsided after the first year of the war, it had really only given place to a steady upward pressure which has gradually forced prices to a new high.

At the same time, Dun and

Bradstreet reported that the wholesale level of one pound of each of 31 foods in general use rose 10 cents (to \$6.61) in the week following Congress' action in killing off most controls during the closing days of the last session. This increase has just begun to be felt at the retail level, and we can expect to feel it more strongly in the future. The drought, which has affected a number of states in the South and New England, will also tend to press the cost of food higher in the coming months.

STEAL BY STEEL

From the point of view of each of us as consumers, the rising cost of living is something which we will just have to suffer. For millions of families it will mean real hardship, with further cuts in food for the family, and less to spend for other necessities, let alone the luxuries. But from the point of view of each of us as citizens, that is, as political people, the question is: Who is responsible, and what can be done about it?

It is easy enough to place responsibility for some of the price rises which still lie ahead of us—

those which will affect all items made of steel or aluminum. The responsibility for those increases lies squarely on the shoulders of the small handful of men who own the steel industry, and who held up the American people by refusing to settle the steel strike until they had been granted price increases far above anything which was "justified" either by the profit levels of their industry or by the Defense Production Act.

The steel industrialists were finally appeased with a price increase of \$5.20 a ton, although the maximum allowable under the law was \$2.84 a ton. Price Stabilizer Ellis G. Arnall has estimated that this price increase alone may mean a \$100-a-year increase in the cost of living for every American family, and Economic Stabilization Administrator Roger L. Putnam stated that the steel firms had pointed a "loaded gun" at the government's head. After all of Truman's militant talk on the steel holdup, he capitulated to the steel bosses' demands. It was the steel magnates who showed that they swing the longer whip.

The reason for the rising cost of living in general is similar to the one which took dramatic form in the steel industry. In the case

of most products, however, prices rise much less dramatically because most other industries have a much larger number of producing units. But the motives of the capitalists are the same: to charge all the traffic will bear in a seller's market.

SELLERS' MARKET

The reason why we continue to have a sellers' market is that the government is pumping about \$8 billion into the economy over what it is collecting in taxes this year, and even more, that this money is being pumped not into consumer goods but mostly into war goods. It is simple ABC that where this is taking place, the only way in which the effects of inflation can be lightened for the majority of the people with low incomes is through strict price controls on all items which they have to buy.

This is ABC to the labor movement, but to the employers it isn't even in the alphabet. And in the last Congress it was, as usual, the employers who had the power, and not the workers. That resulted in the lifting of all controls on processed vegetables (fresh ones had been without ceilings for sometime), a termination of al-

most all federal rent controls on September 30, and an end to the government's power to control consumer credit terms.

POLITICAL FOOTBALL

Both major political parties are going to try to exploit the effects of the rising cost of living in the elections. President Truman is now debating whether he should call a special session of Congress and lay before it proposals to curb the price rises. The idea is that the same Congress which gutted the control program is not likely to reverse itself so quickly, and the Democrats can then blame the price increases on the Republicans. The major difficulty with this idea, however, is that since there is a Democratic majority in both Houses of Congress, such an action might further deepen the cleavages inside the Democratic Party. After all, the labor movement will once more have to point out that it is not just the Republicans, but rather the Republican-Democratic coalition in Congress which refuses to control prices—and on this question it is not only the Southern Democrats who jump the fence.

The other alternative is not to call a special session, and to simply let prices keep on jumping. The idea here is that then the blame can be placed on the Republicans and the 82nd Congress, and that people will be so hopped up about the high cost of living by November that they will reelect the Democrats overwhelmingly. This they will do, presumably, because Truman will continue to point out that he was for controls, but that Congress refused to go along. The Republicans, on the other hand, are hoping that they will be able to blame the high cost of living on the administration.

In this connection we would simply like to make one point. It has become a petrified article of faith in the bible of what passes today for political enlightenment in this country that it is a peculiar feature of Stalinism to seek political advantage from the misery of the people. It is only such depraved people, we are told, who would stoop to measures which will depress the standard of living of the people so as to win their allegiance.

We would like to ask those who hold this truth to be self-evident: What are the Democrats or the Republicans doing about the rising cost of living? And, further, will they refuse to count any votes that may come their way through the increased hardship which their policies are bringing on the people?

Fight Against Rent Gouge On in City Councils

San Francisco:

By JACK WALKER

SAN FRANCISCO, Aug. 6—Under fire from San Francisco apartment house owners, the city Board of Supervisors rejected the findings of the U. S. Census Bureau on the need for rent controls in favor of a new survey to be conducted before federal controls end locally on September 30. The sole effect of this "new survey" is to delay and defeat any city rent-control bill before the federal deadline is passed.

Frank White, secretary of the San Francisco CIO Council, spoke out in favor of accepting the Census findings, "but he was drowned out in a chorus of jeers from citizens opposed to rent controls," reads the *Chronicle's* account of the landlord-packed meeting. "We certainly will not be bound by a one-sided, half-baked survey conducted by one governmental agency to save the jobs of another," said Douglas Dorn on behalf of the apartment house owners, casting aside the usual economy arguments presented to surveys in general and the prestige of the U. S. Census' reports in particular.

Supervisor Byron Arnold first called for accepting the Census Bureau's figures but immediately backtracked in the face of landlord opposition. Instead, a special committee representing the San Francisco Labor Council (AFL), the CIO Labor Council, the "Apartment House Industry of San Francisco," and the "San Francisco Real Estate Association," together with Arnold and another supervisor, will submit a

report on the "scope and cost of a survey and how it should be handled" to the board tomorrow. This report must crawl through debates in the finance committee and the County, State and National Affairs committee before returning to the full Board of Supervisors for their acceptance or rejection. In the meantime September 30 is little over a month and a half away and then all rent controls will die if the survey is not completed and acted upon.

The Bay Area has been witness to the same play before, with only slight changes in cast depending upon the area involved. Each time, in Oakland, Berkeley and El Cerrito, the result has been the same—a narrow-based fight in council rooms followed by victory for the landlords. There is no reason to expect anything better in this drama, unless labor wages an all-out campaign involving broad community elements and organizations, instead of the usual bureaucratic gestures presented heretofore, however well motivated they might be. There is no doubt that should they fail to wage this kind of fight, rents will be allowed to rise immediately, following the example of the other cities involved.

St. Louis:

By JAMES JAIRUS

ST. LOUIS, Aug. 9—The battle by the people here for an extension of rent control was won today, but not before the opponents had caused it to degenerate into a maelstrom of slander and attempted violence.

The present Congress extended federal rent control only until September 30 but provided that individual communities might extend it until April 30, 1953 if a housing shortage exists. With a clear call from the Congress to defeat rent control once and for all, the real-estate interests of eastern Missouri immediately started a savage campaign to convince the St. Louis Board of Aldermen that rent control was unnecessary, as no housing shortage existed. Early concentration of effort in this city was necessary for many of the suburbs have postponed action until St. Louis decides.

Last night some 500 persons, most of them vociferously in favor of ending controls, attended a public hearing on rent control in the city auditorium. John I. Rollings, executive secretary of the AFL Central Trades and Labor

Union, was the major speaker for the people desiring extension of controls. He said, in part, "Families with children are begging and pleading for housing. My union has 100 requests a month from families with children which we cannot fill. There is a serious shortage of [housing]."

Albert Wallace, a leader of the Negro community, speaking in favor of rent control, asked, "Will you doom these people in blighted areas to an alternative only of moving from one rat hole to another rat hole?" There were shouts of "Yes, yes," from the audience. William Barry of the Postal Clerk's Union also spoke in favor of extension.

The principal speaker for the real-estate interests was attorney Stephen F. Thomas, president of the Real Property Owners' League. Thomas began in a calm manner but soon the urge to slander labor and its leader apparently became overwhelming. He declared the rent control law "the most unfair law ever passed in the United States" and that "Communists, Communist labor leaders and others would like to see a totalitarian state support

rent control." "Having thus warmed up to his subject he continued: 'rent control is the essence of Communist philosophy. Advocacy of rent control is advocacy of Communism in America. Any man or group that advocates rent control in this nation is advocating Communism.' Completely carried away, Thomas crowned his outburst with the gem, 'I swear on the altar of God, and I challenge the Bar Association to criticize me for it, that the men and organizations which stand for rent control are Communists.'"

Rollings asked the chairman to have Thomas apologize. Thomas asked him to make Rollings sit down, temper snapped, and Thomas and Rollings became embroiled in a fight which was quickly broken up. The chairman, visibly shaken, adjourned the meeting. But today the Board of Aldermen, unmoved by the Real Property Owners League's "red" charges and without debate or comment, voted unanimously to extend rent controls. The people of St. Louis, with the leadership of organized labor, again defeated the interests of power and privilege.

Both Sides Worried by Mich. Vote

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, August 10.—The results of the Michigan primaries held last week provided the basis, among other things, for the sharpest feud since the Hatfields and McCoy's shot it out in the hills of West Virginia.

The argument is over which one will be the next governor of Michigan. It's Princeton man, G. Mennen Williams, heir to the Mennen and Williams fortunes, son of one of Michigan's important social leaders, versus Fred Alger, Jr., Harvard graduate, heir to the lumber fortune of the Alger family, prominent in Michigan political and social circles for over 100 years.

The black sheep in this case is Williams, of course. He is running as Democratic candidate, backed fervently by the United Auto Workers (CIO). Most political observers in Michigan gave Williams the better chance, even if

Michigan goes Republican, which it has done in every presidential year except 1932. His skill at square dancing, his brilliant appearance and personal popularity have done much to make perennial inroads in the Republican strongholds outside of Wayne County. If this industrial area gives him the usual 2-1 Democratic vote, it looks mighty good for the Williams family.

In the hope of making a major dent in the Wayne County area, the Republicans picked Congressman Charles Potter, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to oppose Williams' running mate, Senator Blair Moody.

The Republican strategy is, of course, to make a big dent in the powerful Catholic vote in Wayne County on the "red" issue, which Potter exploited so skillfully both in conducting the notorious hearings held here last spring and in his primary campaign.

The huge primary vote in Michigan, totaling nearly 1,400,000, by far the highest in its history, has the politicians in both camps worrying a little. No one is quite sure what it means. That the Republican vote was

heavier was expected. It usually is. There are more contests in that party, and voter interest in the primary seems greater among the Republicans.

No one knows for sure what it means that so many Democrats seemed to vote in the Republican primary. This is acknowledged but not understood.

It goes without saying that labor's role in the coming election will be a vigorous, fervent and desperate drive behind the entire Democratic Party slate, national and state.

The strongest apologies, excuses, and whitewashing seen around here for many a year concerns the build-up of Senator Sparkman as did a neat job of polishing up the man to make him acceptable to Detroit's strong Negro bloc of voters, who incidentally, chose a Negro woman for state senator in the Democratic primary, the first time in the history of Michigan.

Subscribe to
LABOR ACTION

THE NEW COURSE

by LEON TROTSKY

The Struggle for the New Course

by MAX SHACHTMAN

Both in one book—Trotsky's historic essay on the beginnings of Stalinism, and Shachtman's study of the development of Russian totalitarianism

\$1.50

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

114 W. 14th St.

New York 11, N. Y.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

INTERESTED? Get Acquainted

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE.....

STATE TEL.....

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:
 Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

NEW RENEWAL
 Bill me. Payment enclosed.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY APT.....

ZONE STATE.....

LONDON LETTER

The U.S. thru British Eyes

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Aug. 6.—The mass of the British people are traditionally suspicious of "smart guys" and "city slickers." On the other hand, they have an instinctive feeling for the "little guy." It was, therefore, comparatively easy for them to choose in the 1948 presidential election between Messrs. Dewey and Truman. That Truman advocated but never executed a civil-rights bill, they did not know; that Dewey had a reputation for ambiguity was known only to the politically conscious few here.

In the forthcoming American presidential election there is a great deal of interest here. The BBC covered the Chicago conventions; there were frequent commentaries from the American radio; and one could even hear recordings of the sessions from the American Forces network in Germany. The newspapers carried up-to-date coverage in every edition.

What impression did the British people get here of all the proceedings? We were amazed and a little disgusted with the political chicanery which went on. Any reference to any racket produced an immediate association of ideas.

Not only that, what was far worse was the attitude of British as well as American "authorities" to the undignified manipulations. The problems of political commentators were not centered around explaining how the different points of view had made impressions with one or another of the state delegations; rather were they concerned with problems of arithmetic and psychology—psychology to determine who would jump on to the winning bandwagon, and arithmetic to add up how many would ensure its success. Post-election jobbery rather than policy seemed to be the keynote of the conventions.

MUSICAL COMEDY

This situation in our opinion does not arise from any greater degree of basic immorality among American politicians; rather it is apparently due to the method of electing a president. In Britain, of course, the chief executive is not "directly" elected, as it is in the U. S.; the prime minister is elected by Parliament, and always depends for support on his majority in the House.

In all the reports of the party conventions, the actual electors seemed to be so distant and impotent. The evidence for their existence seemed to be the deafening cheers and the brass bands, etc. The delegates seemed like the huge cast of a musical trying to make up for lack of audience response by making an enormous row.

On the political plane, the American campaign faces the British with a problem.

The Democrats are viewed here as being traditionally friendly to Britain; Roosevelt and Truman, it has been felt, were "on our side." There was lend-lease, Marshall Plan aid, and the statue of

Roosevelt in London to symbolize the tie between Britain and the Democratic Party presidents.

On the other hand, the Democrats produced new names like Stevenson and Kefauver, who had not been heard of in England. At this point many here seemed to lose interest in the Democrats. The Republicans, with characters like McCarthy and Taft, have not had many good words for England. They often use this country as a bogey with which to threaten recalcitrant American voters. "If you vote Democratic," they suggest, "you too will have rationing of sugar, tea, etc., as in Socialist England." They go on to long vituperations against "British agents" like Dean Acheson and Averell Harriman.

BLP SLANT

The dilemma for many of the British came, however, when they chose Eisenhower as the Republican candidate. Eisenhower, as a personality, was certainly much more likable than other Americans who have had dealings with Europe. His modesty of demeanor commended itself quickly to the English. There was a genuine show of affection when he was shown a Freeman of the City of London after the war. If in domestic affairs he is a political ignoramus and right-winger, his international policy marches well with that of successive British governments.

How does all this impress the British Labor Party people? While officially there is strict impartiality on the subject, it is felt that politically there would not be much difference in foreign affairs who ever gets in. But one gathers that they have an illogical preference for a Democratic president, coupled with a liking for Eisenhower the man, and I guess they would probably have liked it best if Ike were a Democrat.

But we know, when we think it out, that whoever is elected president the American policy will not change significantly. Its future as a power is guided by considerations of interest which transcend the personalities of the candidates.

[One comment from this side: We would agree with our correspondent David Alexander that the staking of American presidential elections like political sideshows is in part due to the method of electing the president. But we would also point to something more basic which permits the major parties to concentrate on parades and pork-barrels rather than political policies. This is the weakness of labor as a political force in the country. While labor tags after one of the old parties, leaving the choice between two capitalist parties which agree on social essentials, the Democratic and Republican politicians are not required to face up fully to issues. Insofar as they do, in fact, it is in large measure due to pressure from labor-liberal wings.—Ed.]

Their Death Was Their Triumph

August 23, 1927
NICOLO SACCO
and
BARTOLOMEO VANZETTI

Their voices are gone into all the earth, and they will be remembered in gratitude and tears, when the names of those who murdered them—
Judges—Governors—Scholars
have gone down into everlasting shame.

Twenty-five years have elapsed since these lines were written. The judge in the case, the governor who refused a commutation, the scholars who gave the sentence a background of respectability, have been generally forgotten, except to those whose memories have been seared by the tragedy that the names still emphasize the everlasting shame of their acts.

Those last days before the execution will ever remain in our minds. Resentment and indignation became an immense roar of protest from all over the world. Thousands of workers, meeting in Hyde Park, London, set up a replica of the electric chair and damned America. Tens of thousands gathered on the streets of Paris to salute Vanzetti's sister, Luigia.

Parades and demonstrations were held, not only in every city of the United States but in every capital of the world—from Madrid to Berlin—from Berlin to

Moscow—from Moscow to Tokyo—from Tokyo to Buenos Aires—in Uruguay, Mexico, South Africa. Strikes were called in protest. Eminent voices cabled their anguished prayers to the governor—Romain Rolland, George Bernard Shaw, Albert Einstein, Alfred Dreyfus. The rising wave of indignant anger broke upon the rocks of Plymouth.

Sacco-Vanzetti headquarters at the Hotel Bellevue in Boston seethed with excitement. Up in Room 712 were gathered a number of lawyers, preparing papers for writs to be sought from all the judges in the vicinity. A picket line walking slowly, like a funeral cortege, filed past the State House. Across the street, outside of Boston Common, were crowds of spectators.

Edna St. Vincent Millay wrote a letter to the Governor: "You promised me, and I believed you truly, that you would think of what I said. I exact of you this promise now. Be for a moment alone with yourself. Look inward upon yourself for a moment. Which way would He have turned, this Jesus of your faith? 'I cry to you with a million voices; answer our doubt! Beert the clemency which your high office affords!'"

"There is need in Massachusetts of a great man tonight. It is not too late for you to be that great man."

We hurried to the State House to deliver the letter. The atmosphere was foreboding. Despondently we left, and quietly returned to the hotel rooms. A call came from lawyers who were still seek-

This memorial article for Sacco and Vanzetti by Arthur Garfield Hayes, general counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union, was released in the current issue of the latter's monthly publication Civil Liberties.

ing a Federal judge. Could we not prevail upon the warden to wait for just a little while? This call rang off. The telephone bell rang again. Tom O'Connor answered: "Nick's gone." A few minutes in silence. The telephone rang again: "It's all over with Bart."

In the light of the millions lost in the First World War, in the Second World War, and in the Korean War, one might well ask why the lives of "a good shoemaker and a poor fish peddler" should be regarded as important. Their lives were not. Their death was. As Vanzetti said to Judge Thayer:—"That last moment belongs to us—that agony is our triumph."

And the reason? These men are symbols, symbols of injustice, of cruelty, of inhumanity, of tyranny. Instead of living out their lives "talking at street corners to scolding men," and dying "unmarked, unknown, a failure," they have become symbols that will mark history.

Probably by this time if they had been left alone, Sacco and Vanzetti would have lived out their unimportant lives. But this way, although "their voices are gone into all the earth, . . . they will be remembered."

Bolivia Regime Kills Land Reform

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Aug. 5.—The "revolutionary government" of Paz Estenssoro promised the workers nationalization of the mines and promised the Indian peasants agrarian reform. The nationalization of the mines was postponed "for study" by a special commission. What are the Nationalists' intentions about agrarian reforms?

What these intentions are could be seen at the "Indian Day" which the regime recently organized. Ten thousand Indian peasants came to the city to back the right wing of the government headed by Paz and Siles. And what did they hear from the government?

The peasant minister, Nuño Chavez, who is looked on as the representative of the left wing of the Nationalist party (the MNR) and as being under "Marxist" influence, declared that agrarian reform does not mean confiscation of property, especially feudal property, but that the Nationalists will "respect" private property—that is, the property of the big feudal landowners. Only "unproductive big property" will be taken by the state and then turned over to the peasants' cooperatives. The "productive big estates," on the contrary, will be protected by the state.

EMPTY PHRASES

This means that the Nationalists do not want to distribute the land to the peasants and that they will protect the traditional feudal property against the revolutionary pressure of the Indians. Instead of the general distribution of the land the government offered only "cooperatives" of the estate-owners and the peasants, and also simply peasant cooperatives wherever there yet exist the ancient Indian communities that have endured since the Spanish conquests and the native republican expropriation of the peasants by the Creole landowners. It promises that these "productive" cooperatives of the estate-owners and the peasants will be given state assistance in agricultural implements, machines and seed grain.

NO FIRST STEP

The destruction of the framework set up by the Spanish conquest, the annihilation of the Creole latifundia, the abolition of the feudal conditions under which the peasants work, these should comprise the first condition for the agrarian, democratic bourgeois (not socialist) reform of the country, laying the basis for a modern capitalist structure. But the Nationalist party, whose leaders and cadres are bound up with the feudal landowning class, is incapable of breaking the feudal chains of the Bolivian economy. And yet

these charlatans speak about the nationalization of the mines and the transformation of the economic structure of the country!

The "Indian Day" proved that the Nationalist party is an outworn reactionary party incapable of progressive reforms, not to speak of "democratic revolution." Of course, I had been quite certain, on the basis of theoretical principles, that the "democratic revolution" was not to be expected (contrary to the Stalinist teachings of the PIR, the Stalinist party, and the semi-Stalinist theory of the "Trotskyist" POR). But I should like to have been proved wrong; I should like to have seen a minimum of reforms carried through in the country; I should like to have seen that, despite my criticisms, the "Trotskyist" POR was doing a little revolutionary work.

SOCIAL CONVULSIONS

Nothing of the sort is going on in Bolivia. The country is suffering social convulsions, civil wars and a coup d'état, because the feudal structure is absolutely obsolete. The masses of workers and peasants want a social revolution, and for many years they have listened to the revolutionary Marxist doctrine of the "left" parties, even if in the distorted forms supplied by the Stalinists and reformists. But the "left" Stalinist or Trotskyist parties are incapable of conquering power, because of the international counter-revolution which centers in Moscow and because of the imperialist supremacy of the U. S.

Therefore, as a consequence of the bankruptcy of the traditional right-wing parties, the Nationalist party came to power, and it must give lip-service to the revolution so as to get the ear of the masses. The real necessity of social revolution in Bolivia is replaced by social demagoguery, by empty phraseology, by charlatanism, because the petty bourgeoisie is not only incapable of achieving the national revolution but any progressive democratic reforms—above all, the

Sparkman Sales Campaign

(Continued from page 1)

above measures were passed or blocked, as the case may be, by a coalition of Republicans and Democrats, the pamphlet does not give the worker any idea of how such a coalition can be prevented from dominating the next Congress even if he goes out and votes.

One of the best things about the pamphlet is its attempt to demonstrate that politics can only be conducted effectively through political parties, and that therefore working to influence and control such parties is at least as important as simply registering to vote for candidates which have been picked by them. But the whole point of this is pretty much lost when the pamphlet fails to give a realistic description of how the existing major parties are actually run and controlled, and instead gives a Polyanian picture of them as democratic bodies.

Since the Democratic convention, the AFL News-Reporter has dedicated itself to two jobs on the political field. The minor one is to explain what happened at the convention and what labor's role was there, and the major one is to sell the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket and the Democratic Party to its readers.

In reporting how Stevenson got the nomination, the AFL simply gives a blow-by-blow report of the convention. We see a battle between the "Young Turks" and the older heads at the convention, and one in which the Dixiecrats come out, if not victorious, then at least without losing their power in the party. Most important, however, the AFL insists, is the

platform. And on that, the Democrats gave labor pretty much what it wanted, while the Republicans offered the workers nothing.

But what role did the labor movement play at the convention? Can the worker who gives his dollar to the LLPE each year feel that it has been used to build up his strength, or the strength of his representatives when it comes to choosing candidates and deciding who will run the political machine which will control the government in the event of victory?

BARKLEY AFFAIR

The AFL makes every effort to deny that it, as such, played any role whatever in the convention. In a first-page article in the issue of July 25 entitled "AFL Role in Dem. Convention Distorted by Press—Here's Facts," the News-Reporter writes that the AFL had any role whatever in the nomination struggle, despite the fact that there were about 60 members of the AFL as delegates at the convention.

But how about the famous Barkley episode? Wasn't the AFL part of the labor group which torpedooed the old man's presidential hopes? Not on your life, says the News-Reporter. At this convention the AFL "limited its activities entirely to the presentation of platform recommendations to the convention's Resolution Committee." And it goes on to say: "This was in complete compliance with the official policy of the American Federation of Labor decided upon last February—namely, to postpone consideration of the question of endorsing a presidential candidate in the 1952 campaign until after the Republican and Democratic conventions had chosen their nominees."

But wasn't George Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks and an AFL vice-president, part of the group who dumped Barkley? And wasn't Majes L. McDevitt, director of the AFL's Labor's League for Political Education, present at the breakfast when the labor leaders delivered their messages to the veep? Yes, the article says, Harrison and McDevitt were there. But the former made it clear that he was acting completely on his own as an individual, and the latter just went for the meal and was much surprised when he saw his name included among the labor leaders who dumped Barkley.

SELLING SPARKMAN

This repudiation of the AFL's role in the Barkley incident was reinforced by a statement by AFL Vice-President Charles J. MacGowan, head of the Boilermakers Union, who told a meeting of the AFL delegates at the convention that "A majority of the members of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor are here in Chicago. Not a single one of them was consulted in advance about this action." But then it is true, despite the picture which the News-Reporter tries to paint of AFL convention delegates not functioning in an organized way, that they did meet as a separate body? Yes, it is true. In other words, whether or not they acted in common, they at least caucused to discuss and decide on the various problems which the AFL faced as such at the convention.

Subsequent issues of the News-Reporter devote considerable space to selling the Democratic platform and its candidates to the workers. True, such articles are usually accompanied by the references to the time-honored "non-partisan" position of the AFL in politics. But the articles which follow these references are so partisan that we doubt if even the men who write them are fooled by the old formulas.

The real problem, as the AFL seems to see it, is to sell Sparkman. Thus the August 1 issue of the News-Reporter has an article entitled "Nixon-Sparkman Voting on Key Issues Listed." And despite the fact that in other ar-

ticles the civil-rights problem is admitted to be, next to the Taft-Hartley Law, the key issue for labor, there is no comparison of the votes of the two candidates on this issue. A convenient omission for Sparkman, we would say.

The same kind of thing is evident in much of the CIO press. An editorial in the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees for August on Stevenson and Sparkman tries to reassure the members of that union when it writes: "Even if the stand [on civil rights] was modified by giving second place to a Southern Democrat, the unequivocal affirmation by Stevenson of civil rights demonstrates that there will be no renegeing on this pledge."

NOT REASSURING

We doubt whether the Negro membership of the RWDSU-CIO will be reassured by this "demonstration," particularly in view of Stevenson's hedging on the Senate cloture rule. And we doubt whether they will be reassured by the brassness which Sparkman has shown—right after being praised by Stevenson for his civil-rights record, too—in spelling out his continued opposition to federal FEPC legislation, as he did this past week.

There is nothing very striking or very new in this performance in the labor press. It is pretty much dictated by the policies to which the labor leaders are committed. Even the same issues of papers which describe and denounce the Dixie-GOP coalition which blocked all the Fair Deal measures in the last Congress are now compelled to whomp it up for the Democratic Party (and for Sparkman) and to carefully avoid the question: How will the return of this party to power with its Southern contingent intact possibly produce a better Congress?

Of course, there is one prominent exception to the way in which the labor press has covered

the Democratic convention. (In this article we are not considering the press of the Stalinist-controlled unions.) That is the United Mine Workers Journal. The only interest this sterling personal organ of John L. Lewis seems to have in the matter is to denounce and vilify, in his own inimitable language, all the labor leaders who got the spotlight at the convention.

JOHN L. AS SAVIOR

To the UMW publication, the only event at the convention worthy of real attention was the Barkley episode. This was the high point of the convention, and in it the stupidity and perfidy of everyone but John L. was once more exposed. Harrison and Reuther are "a couple of political 'dirty deuces,'" when they said that Barkley was too old to be a candidate.

"Mr. George Harrison neglected to say that Vice-President Barkley is a much younger man than Mr. William Green, whom Mr. Harrison supports for re-election for president of the American Federation of Labor. . . . Mr. Walter Reuther, who was accompanied by Mr. Jack Kroll—a much-affiliated gentleman—in the visit to the vice-president, is merely practicing some of the techniques in which he became proficient during his sojourn in Soviet Russia. . . ."

The above are quoted from a message sent by Lewis to one of his lieutenants at the convention. There is, in addition, a long editorial in the August issue of the UMW paper which attacks all the labor leaders for their actions or inactions at the convention, and leaves the impression that only John L. Lewis pursued the course of sagacity and honor in his belated endorsement of Barkley. But what does the UMW publication propose that the workers do in the political realm, now that the savior Barkley is out of the picture? For that we will have to wait for further word from the real savior: John L.

TV Witchhunt Reaches Wechsler, N.Y. Post Editor

A new case marking the witch-hunt atmosphere that lies over television was publicized this past week when the New York Post revealed that its editor, James Wechsler, had been thrown off a TV program on which he had been appearing.

The program, "Starring the Editors," featured a group of newspaper editors discussing issues of the day, among whom Wechsler was the only one fully representing the Fair Deal point of view. When, however, the N. Y. Journal-American published an article (derived from Wechsler's testimony in a suit brought by Lait and Mortimer) "disclosing" that Wechsler had once been a member of the Young Communist League, the sponsor of the program, Grand Union markets, told Wechsler to get off.

Wechsler's political past has never been any secret at all; he quit the YCL a long time ago (in 1937 he says) and has long been vigorously anti-Stalinist.

Although the rest of the panel deplored the action and criticized it on their program, they carried on the show.

No doubt the president of Grand

Union, like other sponsors who have taken similar action, cannot the liberal editor in order not to "associate his business with controversial personalities," the formula of cowardice which is the usual one in these cases. Merle Miller's recent book, The Judges and the Judges, is a study of the extent to which TV performers have been purged and intimidated through similar means by reactionary forces, particularly Counter-attack and Red Channels.

Wechsler, of course, has the advantage of having his own paper in which to talk back, and it is all to the good that the Post has been doing so. Nor does he mind publicizing the case. It must be remembered, however, that in a great number of the cases investigated by Miller, no notoriety could be given.

Footnote: An ironic note was struck when the new secretary of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom added his protest against the Wechsler witchhunt firing. He is Irving Kristol, whose recent article in Commentary explained that there is really no witchhunt going on at all.

In English for the First Time!

Rosa Luxemburg's THE ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL

Yale University Press • 475 pages • \$5
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Candidate in the Making

(Continued from page 1)

which incidentally serves him as a convenient refuge from having to delve deeply and publicly into the mire of a big-city political machine for which he serves as a detached front.

In an article in *Harper's* magazine for February, Stevenson writes eloquently on the subject of crime. We will take from it, only for another purpose, a typical Stevenson parenthetical and self-deprecating remark: "We lawyers fancy that our professional training and experience have a liberating and broadening effect intellectually . . . [but] a layman might well conclude that lawyers are no better than anyone else when it comes to keeping clear the relationships between our general principles and their application in concrete cases."

That Hollow Sound

Two cases come immediately to mind where Stevenson's liberal general principles did not find concrete application—his signing of Law 1030 and decisive motivating sections of his otherwise welcome veto of the Broyles "anti-subversive" bill.

State Law 1030, signed by Stevenson after being passed by a reactionary legislature last year in secret, makes it a criminal offense for petition solicitors to solicit signatures for a state-wide election outside the county in which the solicitor resides. This spring a Citizens Committee Against Law 1030, composed of prominent liberals, ADAers and labor leaders, challenged this law as an unconstitutional monstrosity which would effectively prevent the Socialist Workers Party and the Progressive Party from securing enough petitions to get on the ballot this fall. Fortunately, although the SWP suit was defeated in federal court, the PP suit in the state Supreme Court secured its invalidation.

Even the Chicago *Sun-Times*, long an ardent supporter of Stevenson but which now likes Ike, stated editorially: "We hold no brief for the SWP. . . . [But] we can conceive of a situation in which people of Cook County, representing a majority of the states' voters, might become so enraged at a raw deal handed them in Springfield that they would want to use the threat of a third party to bring the major parties into line. But the threat could not succeed—simply because, under the present undemocratic nominating restrictions, such a third party wouldn't stand a chance. Democracy needs no restrictions now on our statute books."

This incident reveals that Stevenson, for all his democratic pretensions, either is so overwhelmingly dedicated to the two-party system that he (and the Democratic machine behind him) cannot tolerate the thought of other parties coming on the scene, or it represents a personal ducking of an important civil-liberties issue in order to seek favor with Republican legislators and his machine backers who fear any leftish appeals amongst the voters.

In either case it adds that hollow tinkling sound to such a sorry record as he gave to the convention. "Where we have erred, let there be no denial; where we have wronged the public trust, let there be no excuses. Self-criticism is the secret weapon of democracy, and candor and confession good for the political soul."

Juggling the Purge Issue

Veto of the outrageous Broyles omnibus thought-control bill in 1951 brought Stevenson great popularity among liberals both in Illinois and nationally. Here at last was a champion in office. Inserted carefully in his lengthy veto message specifying why he was taking that action, were included numerous ringing denunciatory passages like these, which were eagerly quoted in liberal magazines:

"The whole notion of loyalty inquisitions is a natural characteristic of the police state, not of democracy. Knowing his rule rests upon compulsion rather than consent, the dictator always must assume the 'disloyalty, not of a few but of many, and guard against it by continual inquisition and 'liquidation' of the unreliable. The history of Soviet Russia is a modern example of this ancient practice. . . . To question, even by implication, the devotion and loyalty of a large group of citizens is to create an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust which is neither justified, healthy nor consistent with our traditions. . . . Basically, the effect of this legislation, then, will be less the detection of subversives and more the intimidation of honest citizens. . . . Laws infringing our rights and intimidating unoffending persons without enlarging our security will neither catch subversives nor win converts to our better ideas. And in the long run evil ideas can be counteracted and conquered not by laws but only by better ideas. I must in good conscience protest against any unnecessary suppression of our ancient rights as free men. Moreover, we will win the contest of ideas that afflict the world not by suppressing these rights, but by their triumph. We must not burn down the house to kill the rats."

Sounds good, doesn't it?—especially when we remember that other states were then passing Feinberg and Ober laws

and the like. But the other lengthy sections of the veto message tell a different tale.

He was vetoing first of all because the law was "unnecessary and redundant" since the federal government already had and was using the Smith Act against the subversives; moreover, Illinois anti-sedition laws existing since 1919 were the pattern for the Ober law in Maryland, and he opposes duplications. Secondly, "It is in the enforcement provisions that I find this bill most objectionable" because "I know of no precedent of any such interference with the normal discretion of a public prosecutor," plus a lengthy citing of reasons in similar vein.

On the "Meet the Press" television show on March 30 Stevenson was being quizzed by reporters on his political positions. Richard Wilson of the Des Moines *Register and Tribune* raised the loyalty issue:

Wilson: "You are against loyalty investigations as a general principle, are you not?"

Stevenson: "No, on the contrary . . ."

Wilson: "You say here in a veto message, 'The whole notion of loyalty inquisitions is a natural characteristic of the police state and not democracy.' If you condemn them all, I just wondered . . ."

Stevenson: "I do very much condemn the—what shall we say—the danger of very broad accusation, unsubstantiated charges, which not only endanger . . ."

Wilson: "That's McCarthyism . . . well, you would be in favor of a more scientific investigation."

We're still glad that Stevenson vetoed the Broyles bill, but his performance on the question was very similar to that of Harry Truman on the McCarran Act: Truman, we should remember, vetoed the latter piece of repressive legislation on the ground, essentially, that the same repressive aims could be better achieved by other agencies (specifically the government's administrative powers), while including ringing language on generalities.

Schizophrenia

Stevenson's views prior to the convention on Taft-Hartley were: "I think it needs revision, needs substantial amendment. I don't think it should be repealed. . . anyone who says flatly that he is either for or against that law is indulging our common weakness for oversimplification. The law comprises over 100 sections, and it deals with a vast and varying range of matters affecting labor relations. If those issues are considered one by one, as they must be, I do not believe that there is any single representative group of people who will be unanimous in their views on all. Some features of the law seem to me to advance good labor relations, and other features do not. I think the Democratic platform should recommend modification."

Though Stevenson stated that he now accepts the platform calling for Taft-Hartley repeal, there can be no question that the influence of his earlier position will be felt in Congress, and his statements even quoted there, when the matter again comes before that body and the more reactionary sections of his party put up their fight together with the Republicans to retain Taft-Hartley.

In that sense, too, the struggles in Congress in the future for civil rights legislation strongly implementing the loose platform declarations he now accepts, will be vitiated by his well-known "moderate" views stated prior to the convention. It is true that he has unsuccessfully backed FEPC legislation in Illinois for two sessions of the legislature, but he looks askance at a federal FEPC law, and it is FEPC action on a national scale which is the crux of the civil-rights problem. He has stated that, "The failure of the states to solve the problem clearly warrants a federal approach," but his dogma of local responsibility for so-called local problems leaves plenty of elbow-room for him to put off the federal "approach" to some distance.

At the Democratic convention Stevenson referred to a leader whom "we all respect but who has been called upon to minister to a hopeless case of political schizophrenia." While everyone knew he was characterizing the Republican Party and Eisenhower, there can be little doubt of his own awareness that the same broad label applies equally to the Democratic Party and himself as its new leader. No other explanation will cover all the facts of his reluctant and power-haunted involuntary candidacy. He refused to make it clear publicly that he would accept the nomination until the convention itself, by its own action in subduing its labor-liberal wing and seating the Dixiecrats, achieved a sufficient unity to make a November victory not "hopeless."

The schizophrenic "split personality" is not a personal characteristic of Stevenson's (any more than it is of Eisenhower's) but of his politics. His "middle-of-the-road liberal" sentiments need not be disputed; what is plain is that he is no liberal lion whose steadfast principles can or will hold him cleaving to the line even of "middle-of-the-road liberalism" when in actual contact with the realities of capitalist pressures and war needs in a decaying society.

Not in the Headlines

Old Story

The RFC last month handed out the biggest loan in its history—\$94 million to the San Manuel Copper Corporation, a subsidiary of Magma Copper. The reason, it said, was that there wasn't sufficient private capital available for its operation, this in spite of the fact that the financial interests behind the corporation are rolling in their own millions.

The truth is that the latter simply preferred to hold on to their own money for other purposes, as long as Washington could be gotten to finance them. Senator O'Mahoney said, after hearings, that Newmont Mining Corporation, which is behind Magma, had all the money needed for the enterprise but would rather let Uncle Sam take the risk. "It's just the old story of monopoly," he said. It's also the old story of big interests getting what they want.

Two-Way Stretch

Two news items: (1) The Department of Justice has expanded its anti-trust suit against the DuPont industrial empire, by adding more DuPont family individuals and another corporation to the list of those charged with monopolistic power and practices.

(2) The government will lend \$14.7 million to the DuPont company to expand its titanium-producing facilities.

That shows how to make DuPont smaller and bigger at the same time.

He's Got Socialism

Senator Joe McCarthy of Wisconsin, who doesn't like "government socialism" and handouts, for the second time went to the Naval Hospital near Washington for a free operation at public expense, free doctoring and nursing, virtually free room and board and other services.

New SP

A new socialist party has been formed in Malaya. On June 26, 71 delegates and observers of labor organizations and trade unions met in Kuala Lumpur and decided to form the Pan-Malayan Labor Party. Membership of the affiliated socialist organizations, it reports, is more than 10,000.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, published August 27:

Good Reading. An annotated book list of the best reading in many fields. A Mentor book, 240 pages, 35 cents.

Mister Smith, by Louis Bromfield. A Signet Giant, 336 pages, 35 cents.

See How They Run, by Don M. Mankiewicz. A Signet book, 200 pages, 25 cents.

Elinda, by Frances Clippinger. A Signet book, 192 pages, 25 cents.

Stirrups in the Dust, by Burt Arthur. A Signet book, 144 pages, 25 cents.

The Kiss-Off, by Douglas Heyes. A Signet book, 144 pages, 25 cents.

The Girl in His Past, by Georges Simenon. A Signet book, 144 pages, 25 cents.

The 'Crisis in Education'

(Continued from last page)

They are repeated on a hundred lower levels, and often much more crudely and repressively. Employers fire workers; naturalized citizens are deported; "Communists" (even real ones sometimes) are put in jail.

Naturally, the campus is not exempt from this witch-hunt. A hundred devices have been constructed to intimidate the student; to say that they have succeeded would be an understatement. They have frightened him to the point where ignorance of socialism has become a virtue and cynicism a requirement for graduation. Merely to list the devices is enough to scare any "sensible" student away from political thinking altogether.

Scholarships and fellowships are granted on the condition of political innocence. Teaching certificates are withheld for lack of political purity. Government jobs (the expectation of every other student today, it would seem) demand security clearance. And a hundred federal, state, local and other kind of agencies are busily engaged in spying on, infiltrating, informing against and uncovering "subversives." At least a half dozen big universities even have their own "subversive activities investigator" to check on local campus "reds" and assorted non-conformists.

PRESSURE FOR CONFORMISM

The significant thing to note is that the principle behind such procedures has gained general acceptance, even where specific applications are opposed. Thus, opposition to the concept of a "subversive list" is very weak. Even with respect to such a sacred tenet as academic freedom, liberals now tend to accept, at least some of the basic principles of the witchhunters. On the general scene the elimination of "subversive" teachings has been replaced as a goal by a new and wider aim: the obligatory inculcation of particular doctrines.

Until the advent of William Buckley Jr. (the man of *God and Man at Yale*) there were few people who took seriously, or even held momentarily, the idea that American higher education consisted principally of a mixture of atheism, socialism and crack-pot economics. For they knew that, with a few notable exceptions, and these mainly in some of the larger universities, the majority of college and university teachers were orthodox followers of "respectable" schools of thought.

But the "revelations" about the Yale undergraduate departments, as served up by Buckley Jr., have produced great fears for the training of our tender-minded young. Perhaps as a result, or perhaps merely in the course of events, recent months have seen several developments aimed at "improving the quality of the teaching of economic facts and theories in colleges and particularly our teacher-training institutions." Needless to say, instruction is to be improved by "presenting the facts about our free enterprise economy." There have always been many who agreed with what Buckley proposes: to see that "error and fallacy" are replaced in favor of "Christian orthodoxy" and the political conservatism of the average Yale alumnus.

SYL Institute Announces 3 Classes for Week-End School

The Socialist Youth League has announced the detailed subject matter of the three classes which will make up the educational program of the SYL Institute, an end-of-summer socialist school, which will start Thursday, September 4 in New York City. Registrations from outside the city have been especially urged.

Instructors for the three classes will be Albert Gates, secretary of the Independent Socialist League; Max Shachtman, national chairman of the ISL; and Hal Draper, editor of *LABOR ACTION*.

As previously reported, the registration fee for the Institute has been set at 50 cents per lecture series or \$1.50 for the entire course.

In addition, plans have been made to climax the Institute on Saturday evening, September 6, with a Chinese banquet.

For out-of-New York registrants, every effort will be made by the SYL to provide housing, in order to reduce their expenses.

The outlines for the three classes follow.

Student Socialist

Student-Youth Section of LABOR ACTION

Published bi-monthly for the Socialist Youth League

Section Editor:
SAM FELIKS

The Structure of American Capitalism

Instructor: Albert Gates

- I. The Expansion of American Capitalism.**
Reconstruction and the period of economic expansion. Class stratification in American society. The triumph of monopoly capitalism.
- II. Crisis and International Conflict.**
Imperialist expansion and the world economy. The crisis of decline. New Deal Reformism.
- III. War and the Permanent War Economy.**
The war economy. Growth of state power. Political perspectives and the war economy.

The Marxian Theory Of the State

Instructor: Max Shachtman

- I. The Capitalist State and Its Transformations.**
The origins and nature of the state. State power: theories and myths. Forms of the capitalist state: Bonapartism; fascism.
- II. The Theory of the State and the Socialist Program.**
Marxism, reformism and anarchism on the state. The workers' state: form and content.
- III. The Marxian Theory Reconsidered.**
The theory of bureaucratic collectivism: revision or extension? Lessons of the British Labor government. The theory of the state reapplied.

Get acquainted with

THE SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

For information on SYL program and activities, write to:
SYL, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

Today their wishes are in many places being put into practice. In other cases, they are being carried by default. For why should a teacher risk a position merely in order to stir up controversy? And if the result is a dull and dogmatic inculcation of stale social facts, it is merely another part of the "crisis in education."

We would suggest, however, that the real source of this tendency lies in the trend toward conformism, toward buttressing the conservative ideology of a society being pushed toward war and its kind of "national unity." Again the crisis in education turns out upon examination to be intimately connected with much larger, and broader, social developments. And, in turn, it can only be understood as part of those developments.

"MARKETPLACE OF IDEAS"?

It should be mentioned that one of the pressures toward conformity is for the elimination of radical student groups. It would be a bad and very short-sighted mistake to believe that this is of concern only to student radicals. Often it is the absence of the activist and militant minority tendencies (whatever their specific political character) which deadens the political atmosphere on the campus today. It has this effect whatever one thinks of the ideas of such groups because, even when of small size, they have always had an important influence in leavening the whole campus.

The drive against radicalism redounds to the disadvantage of political activity in general. Thus, when the president of the University of Pittsburgh was asked to explain his rejection of a petition to charter an organization of Young Republicans, he replied: "If we recognized them, we'd have to recognize the Socialists and Communists." The latter, presumably, was unthinkable—in a university whose commencement orators probably still refer to "the marketplace of ideas" out of force of habit—and so all political life is driven outside the campus precincts.

We would emphasize, therefore, that the "crisis in education" does not derive primarily from within the field of education itself, and that it cannot be effectively met by measures which limit themselves to the field of education. It would help, of course, if the backbones of administrations and educators, as well as student leaders, were stiff enough to resist encroachments on some of the best-established principles of academic freedom and liberty of inquiry, and much can be done in this direction on the school level too. This is a responsibility of students, as students, as well as of university administrators. But the most sinister pressures come from outside the campus; these pressures are increasing; and the most important resistance will inevitably be that which takes place in the general arena of politics.

And this is precisely what ties the hands of those who lament the situation with all fervency and sincerity. For as soon as you look outside the campus, the enemy of education shows up as—the war, the war economy, and the war psychology. And the tendency is to turn one's eyes away, for it is dangerous to speak up.

The fact is that, not only on the campus but everywhere else, the trend is to counterpose the needs of the cold war to the needs of democratic life. We are constantly being told that, since there's a war on and a bigger and more catastrophic one looming, democratic luxuries and inconveniences must be sacrificed for "national security."

THE BIGGER QUESTION

We believe that anyone who accepts this dilemma has doomed himself to stand by in lamentation while the symptoms grow progressively worse. In a real sense, he has already accepted the rationale which is that of all authoritarian governments, including the totalitarian regime in the Kremlin. It is not war in the abstract but the war policies of today which are incompatible with democratic processes.

We Independent Socialists support neither Western imperialism nor Stalinist imperialism in this cold war, but it is not necessary for the student to settle the whole question of foreign policy and world crisis in his mind before fighting against reactionary educational trends.

We ourselves see the anti-democratic trends at home as the domestic accompaniment of the policy of the powers-that-be to support abroad any forces of reaction whatsoever as long as they can be used as allies against the Stalinist menace. The same mentality which finds it good to prop up Franco, Syngman Rhee, French masters in Tunisia, et al. also thinks in terms of ensuring "national unity" in this country by bludgeoning opposition. As socialists, on the contrary, we believe that Stalinist imperialism can be stopped and destroyed only by a consistent democratic foreign policy, which can mobilize the peoples of the world (and not merely their reactionary rulers), but which is alien to the politics of the ruling groups in this country, both Democratic and Republican. It is not the tearing-down of democracy which strengthens the free world against Moscow.

That is a much bigger question than the crisis in education, of course, but we would here suggest only that an effective and meaningful opposition to the sinister trends of today must at least make up its mind to this much: That the values of free inquiry and democratic education must not be abandoned on the plea of war necessity or false "ideology." That there must be something wrong with a war ideology which requires that the goods which we are supposed to be defending must be given up in order to win the battle. That we must determine to take a stand against such trends despite the blandishments of pseudo-patriotic rationalizations.

Within the framework of the present orientation of the NSA's leadership, there is no solution. Whether or not a student agrees with the socialist opinion that a consistent fight for a democratic world leads necessarily outside the framework of the capitalist profit system and its war drives (just as it is incompatible with the Stalinist despotism), it is only through that consistent fight that he will find out whether the great ends of world peace and social betterment can be achieved, with any lesser aim.

What Was Bolshevism? A Critical Survey

Instructor: Hal Draper

- I. Before 1917: Bolshevism as a Russian Tendency.**
The Bolshevik-Menshevik split. The political issues: the problem of the coming Russian revolution. The "organizational" questions: party unity, democracy and centralism. The Bolsheviks and the Second International prior to 1914. Was Bolshevism modified in the 1917 revolution?
- II. After 1917: Bolshevism as an International Tendency.**
The European left wing and the Bolsheviks. Foundation of the Communist International: the "21 Points." The German revolution (1918-1921). The revolutionary upsurge in Italy (1918-1920) and the "Serrati question." The "Left Communists" and the C. I. Summary: the early C. I. and its Bolshevism.
- III. Bolshevism and Stalinism.**
The "Zinovievization" of the C. I. and early Stalinism. The rise of Stalinism: the "organizational" vs. the political approach. The Stalinist tendency: from a faction of Bolshevism to a new class. Stalin and the Bolshevik tradition: how much did he use and how much did he repudiate? Is "Bolshevism" relevant today?

ANVIL and STUDENT PARTISAN

In this issue:

Debate on American Foreign Policy
Faulkner's Writing and the Southern Myth,
by Irving Howe
God, the Devil and Jean-Paul Sartre
Can Asia Avert Totalitarianism?
plus other articles and student reports

20 cents per copy

Order bundles now

ANVIL and STUDENT PARTISAN
247 Lexington Avenue, New York City

STUDENT SOCIALIST

AUGUST 18, 1952

STUDENT-YOUTH SECTION of LABOR ACTION

FIVE CENTS

The Problem Before the NSA Convention: What Is the 'Crisis in Education'?

By DON HARRIS

The Fifth National Congress of the National Student Association meets August 18 at Indiana University to consider the "crisis in education." It is not always clear what is meant by this phrase. But the NSA president speaks of "ineffective student government, disaffected student bodies, the absence of real thinking, the lack of international awareness, overemphasis and commercialization of athletics, widespread hysteria, paralysis of academic freedom, moral sloth, spiritual decadence, disinterest, apathy, fear, and prejudice" as manifestations of this "crisis."

In their own way, student independent socialists have been highly aware of this crisis. We have in the above quotation a fairly accurate description of American campus life today. But we think these phenomena have a deeper meaning and are not mere surface phenomena of a particular area of social life. They reflect, we believe, a much deeper crisis of American society, stemming out of its inability to solve its internal and external problems.

Many who are willing to deplore the surface manifestations of this crisis refuse to see its deeper roots inasmuch as to do so would tend to call into question their most cherished values. Yet if the crisis is to be met, it must be with more than a twelve-point program for the "de-emphasis of college sports." And if there is a lack of "awareness" or "leadership," we fear it is because of the superficiality and conservatism which pervades the approach of much official thinking in NSA. It is toward the clarification of these problems, therefore, that we suggest our own analysis of the "crisis" in education, and what lies behind it.

Of all of the shortcomings of the contemporary student, perhaps the most characteristic is his apathy—

apathy toward ideas, toward action, toward values. Everyone is prepared to deplore this apathy and deplore its presence. *Time* magazine, in its eloquent description of our "silent generation," pointed out that youth is traditionally the time of intellectual adventure, the testing of traditional concepts in the light of new needs and goals; yet these are significantly lacking today.

All signs point to the fact that students are almost totally uninterested in the broader implications of their social and cultural studies. They engage in few movements of a socially significant nature. They publish few magazines of a literary, political or cultural character. They seldom challenge the tenets of their teachers, or engage in debate on controversial questions. If graduate students tend to be more informed, they are also more cynical; and if exceptions to the pattern occur, they are becoming scarcer.

THE WAR AS BACKGROUND

Does the explanation for this lie on the campus? In part, yes, but not entirely. In considering what lies in back of student apathy today it is necessary to examine the factors which are molding the American campus as part of the total American scene.

Perhaps most important of all is the restoration of education as a path toward financial success and social advancement. In contrast to the days of the Great Depression when a college diploma meant little more than a scrap of paper to be displayed to an employment agency, today there are 50,000 jobs looking for 20,000 engineering-school graduates.

If education has again become a road to advancement or at least to status and security, this is because of the much larger fact of the peculiar kind of "prosperity" we enjoy today. Without this larger background, there is good reason to believe that colleges might again be turning out WPA workers. But this 1952-type prosperity rests largely upon the spurious incentives supplied by the armament program of the federal government. It is the preparations for war which condition the American campus.

The war not only produces the background conditions of campus life; it creates a series of special factors which influence the entire intellectual, social and institutional pattern of American education. Take for example, the draft. By the very way in which selective-service operates, students are led to apply themselves exclusively to their studies in the narrowest sense: the pursuit of a high-grade average becomes the only means of staying in college. Naturally, with the wonderful prospect of army life as the fruit of failure, extra-curricular activities pale in significance.

If the threat of the draft and the promise of a job constitute a system of punishment and reward for diligence, so the practice of subsidizing research out of government funds represents the means whereby government control of education is extending to college administrations. Their financial problems made more acute by inflation, universities are becoming more and more dependent upon the government's largesse in maintaining research grants and scholarship funds. Yet this is also the means for fastening upon the universities the same system of loyalty checks, security clearances and modes of control over student life that has come to characterize so many other areas of economic and social life.

THE SOURCE OF THE FEAR

Along with other feelings, the American student is today beset by fear. However "melodramatic" this may sound, it can scarcely be disputed. The fact is often stated and as often deplored. Not so often, however, is the source of this fear discussed in full frankness.

There have always been pressures on schools to curb radical thought or action. In the past, however, the main source of such pressure came from "private interests." Such pressures still exist, and in the shape of a local Americanism Committee of the American Legion or some branch of Zoll's "Committee for American Education," they may apply even greater force today than ever before. Yet this is true only because much greater pressures exist, and it is these which rate less mention precisely because they are accepted today by many as legitimate.

We speak, of course, of all those official agencies which have as their business the repression of economic or political heterodoxy. This is not directed merely against Stalinists or their sympathizers. *Time* may deplore the absence in American students of any more exciting political ideology than a "pale, lifeless liberalism," but the fact is that a government purgative known as the attorney general's "subversive list" has all but legalized any more trenchant ideas. Socialist organizations of long-standing and well-defined anti-Stalinist views have been lumped under the label of "communist" or subversive. And, in its search for "poor security risks" government boards have accepted evidence as to a subscription to the *Nation*, personal relations with Negroes and admiration for Eleanor Roosevelt as of interest to them.

These practices prevail on the highest national level of a Fair Deal administration widely regarded as liberal.

(Continued on page 7)

Should NSA Collaborate with the Stalinist Student International?

The convention of the National Student Association will be attended by an official observer from the international Stalinist student organization, the International Union of Students. The Stalinist IUS recently declared for "student unity," and the NSA has reacted favorably toward collaboration with it, to test the sincerity of its motivation.

We cannot welcome this move, and we think the reasons for it are ill-advised and naive.

The question is only slightly complicated by the fact that, within NSA, it is by and large the conservative and religious elements who are adamantly against collaboration with the Stalinist student front, while many liberals favor a "soft" approach. The latter apparently think they are pursuing a "clever" policy designed to "influence students behind the Iron Curtain" by utilizing the offices and framework of the IUS; some may simply be believers in the all-healing virtue of "getting together and talking things over," as if they were dealing with a force in whose case this made sense. But such an attempt to act as junior diplomats is not only futile but harmful to the larger interests of the free student movement everywhere.

To be sure, we do not agree with the arguments presented by the conservative elements who oppose collaboration for their own reasons. The previous policy of non-collaboration by the NSA leadership was held for purely nationalistic motivations, and it was this no doubt which gave rise to the impression that, as the former vice-president of the Scottish Union of Students wrote, "A policy of disaffiliation . . . springs from ignorant anti-Communist hate with nothing constructive to offer."

ONE REASON ONLY

The NSA should make plain that it refuses to collaborate with the IUS for one reason only: it will not grant to a police agency of a totalitarian government the credit of passing itself off as an independent movement of students. Anti-Stalinist students in the Iron Curtain countries can certainly be expected to derive more encouragement from such a policy than if they were treated to the sight of American student leaders addressing the professional hacks and watchdogs whom the Kremlin puts over its youth on terms of friendship.

In dealing with the IUS, the NSA will not be dealing with the students of the Iron Curtain countries but with

their policemen. Can there be any question, at this date, as to what IUS represents?

IUS leaders and representatives are no more democratically chosen by the students than the Stalinist leaders of the "trade unions" are chosen by the workers. A recent dispatch from Prague tells us this all over again. The entire Czech "youth leadership" has been "removed" for reasons of "political unreliability"—in this case, suspected sympathy for the disgraced Slansky. This same youth leadership had itself been installed in office by the same means, for that matter.

The IUS must be considered as a police agency of the Kremlin in the sense as are the straightjacketed trade-union apparatuses, or the NKVD itself. It is essentially an instrument of Stalinist state policy, nothing more. It is an apparatus for controlling the thought and action of its membership. It was the IUS which organized the so-called "Berlin Peace Festival" last summer, a propaganda circus for which it was reputedly allotted \$10 million in expense money by its Kremlin masters.

NO HOBNOBBING WITH THE JAILERS

The international role of NSA has been nothing to be proud of. At the Pan-American Student Conference at Rio, it worked with the most reactionary delegations to prevent independent delegations from declaring themselves opposed to both Stalinist and American imperialism. Disgraceful as its role was in this instance, no better would its role be if it decided to collaborate with the IUS, albeit on "concrete, non-partisan projects." It demands the guarantee that the IUS will "work sincerely and without partisanship" toward commonly accepted goals, etc. There will be no difficulty for the Stalinists to give this "guarantee," only it will be worth as much as the Kremlin's peace dove and its "people's democracy."

There are indications that future IUS projects, such as this year's "Conference for the Defense of the Rights of Youth," are to be organized under "innocent" auspices in order to enlist the support of some who would not otherwise collaborate. There is no reason to be sucked in. There is a positive road for international student collaboration; and that is the formation of genuinely representative associations of free student movements. There is no reason to organize internationally under the wing of the Kremlin.

Collaboration with the IUS would be a blow at the real student youth of Stalinland and not a means of making contact with them. It will not hearten them to see the NSA hobnobbing with their own jailers.

HERE'S A DIFFERENT KIND OF VACATION! Come to the NEW ENGLAND ANTI-WAR SUMMER SCHOOL

organized by Yale's student club Focal Point and supported by: Student Section, Fellowship of Reconciliation; Young Socialists (YPSL); American Friends Service Committee; Socialist Youth League; War Resisters League. Here's the program:

LECTURES AND DISCUSSIONS

led by a faculty consisting of Dr. Eddy Assirvatham, Boston Univ.; Harry Chester, Educational Dept., United Auto Workers; Hal Draper, editor, *Labor Action*; A. J. Muste, Fellowship of Reconciliation.

RECREATIONAL PROGRAM

including sports—tennis, swimming, baseball, volleyball, etc.—square dancing and folk dancing, and special entertainment.

"SOCIALIZATION"

Meet and discuss with anti-war students from all parts of the country.

COST: only \$30 for everything, including meals.
TIME: one week, just before school opens—from 5 p.m. on Sept. 7 to Sept. 13. **PLACE:** Harvard Crossroads, Mass.

For reservations and directions, write to:
FOCAL POINT
1987 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.